



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,936	11/13/2006	Stephen Noel Fitzgerald	C&R-115	5399
23557	7590	12/03/2008	EXAMINER	
SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION PO BOX 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950			LANDSMAN, ROBERT S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			1647	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/573,936	Applicant(s) FITZGERALD ET AL.
	Examiner ROBERT LANDSMAN	Art Unit 1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 72-89 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 72-89 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/28/07

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Formal Matters

- A. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I and SEQ ID NO:34 in the reply filed on 9/22/08 is acknowledged. Therefore, this Restriction is deemed proper and is made FINAL.
- B. Claims 72-89 are pending and are the subject of this Office Action.

2. Foreign Priority

- A. Applicants appear to claim priority to GB 0325038.8 in the Oath submitted 11/13/06. However, according to the Bibliographic Data sheet, no priority to this document has been recorded. Applicants are urged to confirm their desire to claim benefit to the foreign priority document GB -325038.8. The Examiner will update the Bibliographic Data Sheet accordingly.

3. Title

- A. The Examiner has amended the title to "Isolated INSP163 protein" to more clearly reflect the claimed subject matter. If Applicants desire a new title, they are invited to suggest one.

4. Specification

- A. According to 37 CFR 1.821(d) (MPEP § 2422), where the description or claims of a patent application discuss a sequence listing that is set forth in the "Sequence Listing" in accordance with paragraph (c) of this section, reference must be made to the sequence by use of the assigned identifier, in the text of the description or claims, even if the sequence is also embedded in the text of the description or claims of the patent application. Sequences appear in Table 2 on page 66, of the specification but are not identified by SEQ ID NO as required.
- B. When a sequence is presented in a drawing, regardless of the format or the manner of presentation of that sequence in the drawing, the sequence must still be included in the Sequence Listing and a sequence identifier ("SEQ ID NO:X") must be used either in the drawing or in the Brief Description

Art Unit: 1647

of the Drawings. See MPEP ' 2422.02. In the instant application, a sequence identifier must be used for the sequences appearing in Figures 2 and 3.

C. The Brief Description of Figure 3 should be amended to initially recite all of the panels of that Figure. For example, it should recite "Figures 3A – 3F;" instead of "Figure 3;".

D. Though none could be found, Applicant is advised that embedded hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable code are impermissible and require deletion. The attempt to incorporate subject matter into the patent application by reference to a hyperlink and/or other forms of browser-executable code is considered to be an improper incorporation by reference. See MPEP 608.01(p), paragraph I regarding incorporation by reference.

E. Though none could be found, trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

F. Though none could be found, any U.S. or Foreign Applications cited in the specification which have since issued should be updated with the corresponding Patent No.

5. Claim Objections

A. Claims 73-80 and 82-89 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 72 recites that the polypeptide is SEQ ID NO:34. The claim does not recite "comprising"; therefore, claim 73, which depends from claim 72 and recites "comprising" broadens claim 72. A similar situation arises in claim 74 which recites "comprising a fusion protein..." Claims 82 and 83 are similar to claims 73 and 74, respectively. Claims 75-80 and 84-89 are objected since they ultimately depend from claim 72 or 81.

6. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

A. Claims 72-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by a specific, substantial and credible asserted utility or a well established utility. These claims are directed to a polypeptide consisting of SEQ ID NO:34. However, the invention encompassed by these claims has no apparent or disclosed patentable utility. This rejection is consistent with the current utility guidelines, published 1/5/01, 66 FR 1092. The instant application has provided a description of an isolated protein. However, the instant application does not disclose a specific and substantial biological role of this protein or its significance.

Applicants disclose in the specification that the claimed receptor is believed to be a secreted protein (INSP163) containing a jelly-roll fold, more particularly a member of the TNF family of cytokines and specifically a c1q-like protein. Applicants further purport that the protein and its encoding nucleic acid can be used for diagnosis, prevention and treatment of disease. There is little doubt that, after complete characterization, this protein will probably be found to have a patentable utility. This further characterization, however, is part of the act of invention and, until it has been undertaken, Applicants' claimed invention is incomplete.

Though the specification discloses the function of c1q proteins, the specification fails to teach the skilled artisan the utility of the claimed polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:34 which is only known to be, at most, homologous to c1q. This is most clearly seen in the designation of the instant protein as a "*c1q-like*" protein, and not a c1q protein. Examples of purported utilities are discussed below.

1) *in diagnosing a dysfunction associated SEQ ID NO:34 (e.g. p.57 of the specification)*. This asserted utility is credible and specific, however, it is not substantial. The specification does not disclose any function, nor any dysfunction, associated with altered levels or forms of the polypeptide encoded by SEQ ID NO:34. Significant further experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to identify a dysfunction or disease associated with the claimed polypeptide. There is no disclosure, for example, of any symptoms associated with such a disease or dysfunction of the polypeptide. Since this asserted utility is not presented in mature form, so that it could be readily used in a real world sense, the asserted utility is not substantial.

2) *For the production of antibodies (e.g. p.27)*. This asserted utility is credible and substantial, but not specific. Antibodies can be made to any polypeptide. However, if the specification discloses nothing

Art Unit: 1647

specific and substantial about the polypeptide, both the polypeptide and its antibodies have no patentable utility.

3) *Tissue localization (e.g. p. 36).* This asserted utility is credible but not substantial or specific. Probes can be designed from any polynucleotide encoding a polypeptide. Since this asserted utility is not present in mature form, so that it could be readily used in a real world sense, the asserted utility is not substantial.

4) *To search for drugs as ligands or antagonists of the polypeptide (e.g. p. 43-44).* This asserted utility is credible and specific. However, it is not substantial. The specification does not characterize the polypeptide encoded by the polynucleotide of the claimed invention. Therefore binding sites, etc. are not identified. Significant further experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to characterize the protein and search for ligands. There is no disclosure, for example, of how to assay for ligand binding and possible transduction mechanisms. It is not known the class of drugs to use or what measurements to perform. Since this asserted utility is not presented in mature form so it could be readily used in a real world sense, the asserted utility is not substantial.

Therefore, the instant claims are drawn to a polypeptide which has a yet undetermined function or biological significance. There is no actual and specific significance which can be attributed to said protein identified in the specification. For this reason, the instant invention is incomplete. In the absence of a knowledge of the natural ligands or biological significance of this protein, there is no immediately obvious patentable use for it. To employ a protein of the instant invention in the identification of substances which bind to and/or mediate activity of the said receptor is clearly to use it as the object of further research which has been determined by the courts to be a non-patentable utility. Since the instant specification does not disclose a "real-world" use for said protein then the claimed invention is incomplete and, therefore, does not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 as being useful.

Furthermore, since the polypeptide of the invention is not supported by a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility, the fusion proteins and compositions comprising the polypeptide also lack utility.

7. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph - enablement

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it

Art Unit: 1647

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

A. Claims 72-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to use the instant invention. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by a specific, substantial and credible asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

8. Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

A. Claims 72-89 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 44, 46 and 47 of copending Application No. 11/912,432. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 44 of '432 recites treating osteoarthritis using a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:34, which is the polypeptide of the instant invention. As seen in paragraph [0081] of '432, osteoarthritis appears to be a preferred embodiment (i.e. "particularly") for treatment with the polypeptide of the instant invention.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1647

9. Conclusion

A. No claim is allowable.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Landsman, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0888. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10 AM – 6:30 PM (eastern).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath Rao can be reached on 571-272-0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Robert Landsman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647